

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 remain pending in the present application as amended. Independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. No new matter has been added. In particular, the newly recited language in claims 1 and 18 regarding the sets of clients, adapters and first communication protocols may be found in the application as filed at least in connection with Fig. 1 and the discussion thereof.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner has rejected the claims under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Elza et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0230903). Applicants respectfully traverse the Section 102 rejection insofar as it may be applied to the claims as amended. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that the Elza reference fails to disclose or even suggest a system or method where a plurality of clients each communicate with a corresponding adapter according to a differing first communication protocol and the adapters all communicate with a common server engine according to a common second communication protocol in the manner recited in independent claims 1 and 18 as amended.

Independent claim 1 as amended recites a system for transporting agnostic pull mode messaging that requires a plurality of first clients. As may be understood, each first client may differ from other first clients. For example, one first client may be a desktop computer messaging service that communicates according to a first type of [first] communication protocol, while another first client may be a handheld messaging service that communicates according to a second type of [first] communication protocol, while yet another first client may be a mobile-phone based messaging service that communicates according to a third type of [first] communication protocol. Thus, if each client were to communicate directly with a server engine to effectuate messaging, the server engine would be required to be capable of communicating in each of the first, second, and third types of the first communication protocol. Of course, providing the server engine with such functionality becomes cumbersome and unwieldy,

especially as the number of types of the first communication protocol that the server engine must handle grows.

Accordingly, and as recited in claim 1, each first client has a corresponding first adapter with which the first client communicates according to the corresponding first communication protocol, and all of the adapters communicate with the server engine by way of a common second communication protocol. In particular, and as recited in claim 1, each first client sends a corresponding first message to a corresponding first adapter using a corresponding first communication protocol, receives a corresponding response from the corresponding first adapter using the corresponding first communication protocol indicating that the corresponding first message was received, and resends the corresponding first message to the corresponding first adapter using the corresponding first communication protocol if the response from the corresponding first adapter is not received within a predetermined time period.

The corresponding first adapter for each first client receives the corresponding first message and sends the response to the corresponding first client using the corresponding first communication protocol indicating that the corresponding first message was received, generates a corresponding second message based on the corresponding first message, and sends the corresponding second message to the common server engine using the common second communication protocol. The common server engine receives each second message and executes at least one instruction based on the received second message, and a message storage stores data associated with each second message. As now recited in claim 1, the first communication protocol corresponding to each first client is different from the first communications protocol corresponding to every other first client, each first adapter is constructed to communicate with the corresponding first client according to the corresponding and differing first communication protocol, and every first adapter is constructed to communicate with the common server engine according to the common second communication protocol. As also now recited in claim 1, each first adapter is local to the common server engine and remote from the corresponding first client.

Independent claim 18 as amended recites subject matter similar to that of claim 1, albeit in the form of a method.

The Elza reference discloses multiple clients accessing a server / server engine, as is best seen in Fig. 3. However, each Elza client does not communicate with the Elza server by way of an adapter and a differing first communication protocol, as is recited in claims 1 and 18. Likewise, no adapter is present in the Elza system that communicates with a corresponding first client according to a corresponding and differing first communication protocol and also communicates with the common server / server engine according to a common second communication protocol, as is recited in claims 1 and 18. Also, the Elza server / server engine is not disclosed as having such adapters local thereto and remote from the corresponding first clients, as is recited in claims 1 and 18.

The Examiner points to a DCOM adapter associated with each Elza client as being akin to the recited adapter in claims 1 and 18. However, the Elza reference appears to be silent with regard to each Elza adapter employing a differing first communication protocol to communicate with a corresponding Elza client, and it instead appears that such a first communication protocol that is employed by each Elza adapter in fact is a common protocol and not differing as between clients, as is required by claims 1 and 18. At any rate, and again, such Elza adapters are associated with the Elza clients, and thus are not local to the Elza server / server engine and remote from the corresponding Elza clients, as is also required by claims 1 and 18.

In point of fact, the Elza reference does not appear to appreciate that different Elza clients might wish to communicate with the Elza server / server engine by way of differing first communication protocols. Thus, the Elza reference would not disclose or even suggest that the differing first communication protocols be accommodated by providing each Elza client with a corresponding adapter with which the first client can communicate according to the corresponding differing first communication protocol, where the adapter also communicates with the Elza server / server engine according to a common second communication protocol, and is local to the Elza server / server engine, as is required by claims 1 and 18.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2833/305223.01
Application No.: 10/750,191
Office Action Dated: June 23, 2008

PATENT

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Elza reference does not disclose or even suggest the use of adapters in the manner recited in claims 1 and 18, as amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Elza reference cannot be employed to anticipate or even make obvious such claims 1 and 18 as amended or any claims depending therefrom, including claims 2-17 and 19-31. As a result, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2833/305223.01
Application No.: 10/750,191
Office Action Dated: June 23, 2008

PATENT

In view of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application including claims 1-31 is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: September 18, 2008

/Joseph F. Oriti/
Joseph F. Oriti
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439